



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/585,222	06/01/2000	Roger Massey	GEMVAL PISAUS	4902
20210	7590	07/09/2004	EXAMINER	
DAVIS & BUJOLD, P.L.L.C.			BONDERER, DAVID A	
FOURTH FLOOR				
500 N. COMMERCIAL STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MANCHESTER, NH 03101-1151				3732

DATE MAILED: 07/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

VW

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/585,222	MASSEY, ROGER	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	D. Austin Bonderer	3732	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 May 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-3 5-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 2, 5, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Matousek.

Matousek discloses a barstock ball valve comprising:

- An inlet and an outlet;
- A substantially uniform cross-section;
- A main flow port;
- Increased thickness on one side (the top);
- All openings machined from barstock;
- A stem port that is perpendicular; and
- A quarter turn ball valve

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Matousek.

The method of making is either inherent or obvious in view of Matousek's machined valve.

5. Claims 3 and 8 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matousek in view of Dicky.

Matousek discloses (col. 3, lines 4-7) that "the flow pattern could be three-way valve with a Y flow pattern or other more complex flow arrangements." Dicky discloses a more complex three-way valve flow. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide Matousek with the flow pattern as taught by Dicky for the reasons as taught by Matousek. It would also be obvious to build the valve in the claimed manner.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 5-21-04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The reference meets the bounds of the amended claims. Matousek discloses a valve made of Barstock with substantially uniform cross-section. There is no indication that the barstock from which the valve is made had variations in it. In view of claim 6 and the specification, that is all that is required by the claims. The meaning that the Applicant is trying to instill on the terms is not supported by the claims or the specification. Interpreting the language as the applicant argues is very close to new matter.

The applicant states:

"The Applicant adamantly disagrees with the assertion that this raised section 82 can be construed as a "thicker wall" of the valve housing 10 merely because there is extra material left from a milling operation to form the extension 82 for supposing the valve handle 66. It readily apparent

from observing Figs. 1 and 4 that the fluid passage extends directly down the middle, and between the inlet and out ends 14, 16 of the valve housing 10."

It has always been the assertion of the Examiner that it is exactly what the instant application does. The failure to remove material from areas that do not incur stress or leave material in areas that do is not novel. One saves time in manufacturing; the other extends the life of the valve. Yet that is the entire basis of the instant application. In any case there is nothing in the reference that would suggest that it didn't come from a barstock that has the design with the thicker wall on top. There is no indication that the wall was added before or after the milling. The Barstock selected by Matousek has a thicker portion on top and a substantial uniform cross-section and anticipates the claims.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to D. Austin Bonderer whose telephone number is 703.306.5911. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin P Shaver can be reached on 703.308.2582. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

dab 



KEVIN SHAVER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700